



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,038	04/30/2001	Brian T. Murren	GE1-008US	5210
21718	7590	11/02/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC SUITE 500 421 W RIVERSIDE SPOKANE, WA 99201			PAULA, CESAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/847,038	MURREN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-10,12,14-27,29,30 and 34-37 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/18/2006.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 6, 11, 13, and 28 have been canceled. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, 20, 26, 34, and 36 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 4/30/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hitchcock et al, hereinafter Hitchcock (Pat.# 6,345,278 B1, 2/5/2002, filed on 6/3/1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, Hitchcock teaches creating a form in accordance to an institution's request. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution—*receiving an indication of a desired form to be used for data input; automatically identifying one or more data input fields to be included on the form, and generating, after automatically identifying the one or more data input fields, a form definition including the automatically identified data input fields*-- (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form—*request*--, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*identifying one or more interactions associated with a business logic, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the form. identifying in the one or more interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere*, but the form (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27). The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code-- *and wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request*;

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Hitchcock discloses an XML parser for generating applications of form elements including validation rule elements for validating data associated with the form elements—*automatically identifying for each of the one or more input fields, one or more restrictions* (col.21, lines 30-67).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Hitchcock discloses an XML parser for generating applications of form elements including validation rule elements for validating data associated with the form elements—*automatically identifying for each of the one or more input fields, one or more restrictions* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.21, lines 30-67). In other words, the processor requests the data for the display of the fields from a forms engine—*requesting and receiving the one or more restrictions from a business logic, which subsequently processes requests submitted via the form.*

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*identifying one or more interactions associated with the business logic, identifying in the one or more interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for

providing the missing data—*requesting and receiving the one or more input fields from a business logic, which subsequently processes requests submitted via the form* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 1-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data —*communicating with a business logic to identify one or more input fields* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 8, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*a plurality of interactions to process requests, comprising an identification of one of the plurality of interactions or data input into the fields* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding independent claim 10, Hitchcock teaches a forms engine for creating an html form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files.

Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form validation code to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution— *automatically identifying one or more restrictions associated with a data input field; and using, after automatically identifying the one or more restrictions the one or more restrictions and the field to generate a text markup language form definition.*-- (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.11, lines 1-col.12, line29, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form—*request*--, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*communicating with a business logic to identify the one or more restrictions, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the form, the communicating including identifying one or more interactions associated with the business logic, and identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere, but the form; (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).* The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code-- *and wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request;*

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 11, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*requesting, and receiving from the business logic an identification of the one or more restrictions* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 10, Hitchcock teaches a forms engine for creating an html form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form validation code to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution—*automatically identifying the data input field to be included in the text markup language form--* (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.11, lines 1-col.12, line29, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 14, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form—*identifying in the one or more interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere*, against requirements

of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 14, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data —*automatically identifying that a data input to the automatically identified data input field is required when submitting the form* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 10, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form fields, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 10, Hitchcock discloses checking the information, such as text, submitted by the user on the form fields, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding independent claim 20, Hitchcock teaches creating a form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution— *determining one or more attributes that are used by the business logic but not obtained by the business logic elsewhere* other than the form definition, and *using after determining the one or more attributes...* (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Further, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form—*request*—, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data— *the determining is based at least in part on one or more interactions associated with the business logic* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27). The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code— *each of the one or more interactions being associated with a request to be processed by the business logic and including, one or more command definitions to process the request;*

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses replacing directives with appropriate validation code in html for validating the form fields—*including validation code in the form definition associated with the defined one or more fields*— (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 20, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 20, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data. A second stage validation is performed when the form is submitted to an institution (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 67).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 20, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data. A second stage validation is performed when the form is submitted to an institution —*identification of additional restrictions and receiving from the business logic, the identification of the additional restrictions--* (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 67).

Claims 24-25 are directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable medium for storing computer-executable instructions for performing the steps found in claim 22, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 26, Hitchcock teaches creating a form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Further, Hitchcock discloses replacing directives with appropriate validation code in html for validating the form fields—*validation code from the tag library to verify that a subsequent input to the data field satisfies the one or more automatically identified restrictions* (col.10, lines 40-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27). In other words, the html code associated with the validation information for the form fields, is retrieved from a file source, such as a data structure—*tag library*--.

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form—*request*--, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*identifying one or more interactions associated with a business logic, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the form; identifying in the one or more interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere*, but the form (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code-- *and wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request;*

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 26, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27)—*automatically identify restrictions, and include in the form definition, the validation code to verify that the subsequent input to the data field.*

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 26, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data. A second stage validation is performed when the form is submitted to an institution (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 67)—*identifying one or more interactions associated with the business logic, identifying in the one or more interactions one or more attributes that are not obtained elsewhere, additional data input fields to be included in the form based at least in part on the identification of the one or more attributes not obtained by one or more interactions elsewhere.*

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 34, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 27).

Regarding independent claim 34, Hitchcock discloses a forms engine—*form processing module*-- for replacing directives with appropriate validation code, found in a data structure, in html for validating the form fields—*validation code from the tag library to verify that a subsequent input to the data field satisfies the one or more automatically identified restrictions —restrictions in a form definition for the form*-- (col.10, lines 40-col.12, line29, col.14, lines49-col.15, line 27).

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 34, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 27).

Regarding independent claim 36, Hitchcock teaches a forms engine—*form processing module*-- for creating a form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution (col. 6, lines 3-11,

col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Furthermore, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database—*attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interaction elsewhere*, but the form, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data—*indicating that the one or more identified attributes are to be obtained via a data input field on a form, and further indicating that an input for the data input field is needed when submitting the form* (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29,col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 27). The form requesting a review of the information included therein, is coded using a format such as HTML code-- *includes one or more command definitions for the business logic to process the request*;

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 36, Hitchcock discloses checking the information submitted by the user on the form to a database—*attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interaction elsewhere*, against requirements of the institution. If the data submitted does not meet the criteria, the form is returned to the user for providing the missing data (col.14, lines 48-col.15, line 27).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, and 34-

37, have been considered but are not persuasive. Concerning the arguments that Hitchcock does not teach the automatic identification of claim 1 (pages 12-13), the Examiner disagrees, because Hitchcock teaches creating a form in accordance to an institution's request. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution—*automatically identifying one or more data input fields to be included on the form*, (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.11, lines 45-col.12, line29, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67). The form fields are automatically added in accordance to the institution's request, and the form attributes.

Regarding claim 10, the Applicant indicates that Hitchcock does not teach the communication with a business logic to identify the one or more restrictions (pages 14, parag.2), the Examiner disagrees, because Hitchcock teaches a forms engine for creating an html form in accordance to an institution's request, such as using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form validation code to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution—*automatically identifying one or more restrictions associated with a data input field; and using, after automatically identifying the one or more restrictions the one or more restrictions and the field to generate a text markup language form definition*.— (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.11, lines 1-col.12, line29, and col.21, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 20, the Applicant indicates that Hitchcock does not teach that the attributes are not obtained by the logic elsewhere (pages 14, parag.4), the Examiner disagrees, because Hitchcock teaches creating a form in accordance to an institution's request, such as

using template files. Attributes are utilized for automatically adding form fields to an application(s) for requesting information chosen by the institution— *determining one or more attributes that are used by the business logic but not obtained by the business logic elsewhere* other than the form definition, *and using after determining the one or more attributes...* (col. 6, lines 3-11, col.7, lines 29-38, 60-67, col.8, lines 60-col.9, line 20, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lines 1-67). The attributes are obtained from the form and not elsewhere.

Claims 2-5, 7-9, 12, 14-19, 21-27, 29, 30, and 34-37 are rejected at least based on the rationale set forth above.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, {(571)-273-8300 as of July 15, 2005} (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/30/06